UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/738,240	12/15/2000	Krishna Kishore Yellepeddy	AUS9-2000-0694-US1	2745

7590 07/15/2004

Law Office of Joseph R Burwell
P O Box 28022
Austin, TX 78755-8022

EXAMINER	
SHIFERAW, ELENI A	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2136	

DATE MAILED: 07/15/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/738,240	YELLEPEDDY ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Eleni A Shiferaw	2136	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) 1-54 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) 1-54 is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-54 are presented for examination.

2. The examiner partially considers the preliminary amendment filed on December 15, 2000. The examiner did not consider the following preliminary amendment because the page and line number mentioned do not appear on the amended pages. Please check the pages and correct the preliminary amendment.

Page 17,1ines 2-3 delete "For example, one application may need a simple CA that is able to issue certificates and manage the life cycle of these certificates-- and insert therefor --For example, one application may need a simple CA that is able to issue certificates and manage the life cycle of the certificates including revocation of certificates and generating certificate revocation lists--.

Page 20, lines 2-7 delete "This LDAP publisher bean 370 publishes any specific parameters associated with such a request to an LDAP directory structure 373. Again, this may take place as the request winds its way through the PKI request system 300 an initial time. Or the publishing of the request in the LDAP directory 373 may take place in the return path of the request after reaching the terminus bean" and insert therefor--This LDAP publisher bean 370 publishes certificates or certificate revocation lists. These certificates or certificate revocation lists are obtained in the return path of the requests after reaching the terminus bean--.

Claim Objections

3. Claim 40 objected to because of the following informalities: on line 18 the word "the" typed twice, and line 19 the word transmission spelled as " transmision". Appropriate correction is required.

Drawings

4. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference character(s) not mentioned in the description: Fig. 3, "PKC10Server Bean 322" is written as "PKCS10Server Bean 312" in the description on page 16 line 25 and all the hand written numbers are not clear. Corrected drawing sheets, or amendment to the specification to add the reference character(s) in the description, are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 1-6, 8-14, 16-22, and 24-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by French et al. (French, Pub. No: US 2001/0001877 A1)

7. As per claims 1, and 25, French teaches an apparatus for managing a digital certificate on distributed computing system, the apparatus comprising:

at least one reception software module that receives a request from a user and generates a reception event corresponding to that request; (Page 4 par. 0066, Fig. 45 130; application server receives user requests (110), Fig. 45 No. 120 authentication server receives user request from user (110) or application server (130)),

at least one processing software module, communicatively coupled to the at least one reception software module and responsive to a propagated event, that performs an action regarding the management of the digital certificate; (Page 9 par. 0156, Fig. 45; authentication server (120) coupled to application server (130) and responsive to propagated event),

any one the software modules replaceable with another software module responsive to the same propagated event but performing another action regarding the management of the digital certificate; (Page 4 par. 0066; client 110 and authentication server 120 can communicate for requested data directly without passing through application server 130) , and

the software modules executing independently from one another. (Fig. 45; application software module (130) is vendor's server, user (110), and authentication server (120) are all running separate).

8. As per claim 40, it has been rejected under the same rational as claim 1 above. In addition at least one transmission software module, communicatively coupled to the at least one processing software module, that transmits information regarding the digital certificate on the distributed computing system in a first format in response to a propagated event; (Fig. 45; authentication server (120) transmits information to application server (130) and coupled to application server (120), application server (130) is also a processor and transmits digital certificates to users),

the at least one transmission software module replaceable with another reception software module responsive to the same event that the replaced transmission software module is responsive to, and transmitting information in a second format; (Page 4 par. 0066; client 110 and authentication server 120 can communicate for requested data directly without passing through application server 130).

9. As per claims 9, and 30 French teaches a computer program product on a computer usable medium, the computer usable medium having a computer usable program embodied therein for managing a digital certificate on a distributed computing system, (Page 2 par. 0020) the computer usable program including:

instructions for receiving a request from a user and generating a reception event corresponding to that request (Fig. 1; inputs users information and renders authentication decision, Fig. 37-40; issues digital certificates, Page 4 par. 0066; authentication server's instruction can also communicate with user and generate events and so as application server's instruction (130)),

one or more instructions for performing an action regarding the management of the digital certificate, the instructions for performing communicatively coupled to the instructions for receiving and responsive to a propagated event; (Fig. 1, Fig. 12, Page 9 par. 0156),

any one of the instructions replaceable with another set of instructions responsive to the same propagated event but performing another action regarding the management of the digital certificate; (Page 4 par. 0066, Fig. 45; authentication server (120) can communicate to user (110) with server directly with out application sever (130), and

the instructions executing independently from one another. (Fig. 45; application software module (130) is vendor's server, user (110), and authentication server (120) are all running separate).

10. As per claim 45, it has been rejected under the same rational as claim 9 above. In addition

a first instructions for transmitting information in a first format regarding the digital certificate on the distributed computing system in a first format in response to a propagated event, the instructions communicatively coupled to the at least one processing software module; (Page 4 par. 0066, Fig. 45),

the first instructions for transmitting replaceable with a second instructions for transmitting, the second instructions for transmitting responsive to the same event, and

that first instructions were responsive to and transmitting information regarding the digital certificate in a second format; (Page 4 par. 0066; client 110 and authentication server 120 can communicate for requested data directly without passing through application server 130) .

11. As per claims 17, and 35, French teaches a method for managing a digital certificate on a distributed computing system, the method comprising:

receiving a request from a user in at least one reception software module; (Fig. 45 No. 110 and 130),

generating a reception event corresponding to that request; (Fig. 45 No. 130 and 110),

performing an action regarding the management of the digital certificate in response to a received event in an at least one processing software module, the at least one processing software module communicatively coupled to the at least one reception software module; (Fig. 45 No. 120, page 8 par. 0145),

any one of the software modules replaceable with another software module responsive to the same propagated event but performing another action regarding the management of the digital certificate; (Page 4 par. 0066; It is possible for client 110 and authentication server 120 to communicate the requested data directly without passing through application server 130), and

the software modules executing independently from one another. (Fig. 45; application software module (130) is vendor's server, user (110), and authentication server (120) are all running separate).

12. As per claim 50, it has been rejected under the same rational as claim 17 above. In addition

receiving a request in a first format from a user in one or more reception software modules; (Page 4 par. 0066; application server (130), and authentication sever (120) both receive a request in a first format),

performing an action regarding the management of the digital certificate in response to a received event in an at least one processing software module, the at least one processing software module communicatively coupled to the plurality of reception software modules; (Page 8 par. 0145Fig. 45 No. 120 is communicatively coupled to No. 130, 110, 26, 32, 40, 1012, and 130),

transmitting information regarding the digital certificate in a first format from a first transmission software module upon the reception of a propagated event; (Fig. 45 No. 130 transmitting certificate to user (110) and also page 4 Par. 0066; authentication server communicating directly to user (110) to propagate event),

the first transmission software module replaceable with a second transmission software module, the second transmission software module responsive to the propagated event and transmitting information regarding the digital certificate in a second format; (Page 4 par. 0066; It is possible for client 110 and authentication server 120 to communicate the requested data directly without passing through application server 130), and

the software modules executing independently from one another. (Fig. 45; application software module (130) is vendor's server, user (110), and authentication server (120) are all running separate).

13. As per claims 2, and 26, French teaches the apparatus, wherein the plurality of reception software module is implemented in a computing system independent manner (Fig. 45 user (110), authentication server (120), and apparatus server (130)).

14. As per claim 3, and 27, French teaches the apparatus wherein the plurality of reception software module is implemented in Java (Page 3 par. 0062, page 4 par. 0071).

15. As per claim 4, French teaches the apparatus wherein one of the at least one processing software modules is a sink bean (Page 11 par. 0180).

16. As per claim 5, French teaches the apparatus wherein the sink bean certificate generation bean (Page 11 par. 0173).

17. As per claims 6, and 29, French teaches the apparatus of claim 25 wherein one of the at least one processing software modules publishes information regarding the management of the certificate. (Page 11 par. 0180)

18. As per claim 8, French teaches the apparatus of claim 1 wherein two of the software modules operate on different computing devices. (Page 1 par. 0019, Fig. 45 authentication server (120) and application server (130), and user (110))

19. As per claims 10, and 31, French teaches the computer program product, wherein the instructions for receiving are implemented in a computing system independent manner (Fig. 45 application server (130) and authentication server (120) both receive information (Page 4 par. 0066) and compute independently).

20. As per claims 11, 32, French teaches the computer program product wherein the instructions for receiving are implemented in Java. (Page 3 par. 0062, page 4 par. 0071)

21. As per claim 12, French teaches the computer program product wherein instructions for performing are a sink bean. (Page 11 par. 0180)

22. As per claim 13, French teaches the computer program product wherein the sink bean is a certificate generation bean (Page 11 par. 0173).

23. As per claim 14, French teaches the computer program product of claim 9 wherein the instructions for performing publishes information regarding the management of the certificate (Fig. 45 No. 130, Page 4 par. 0066).

24. As per claim 16, French teaches the computer program product of claim 9 wherein the instructions operate on different computing devices (Page 1 par. 0019, Fig. 45 authentication server (120) and application server (130), and user (110)).

25. As per claims 18, and 36, French teaches the method wherein the plurality of reception software module is implemented in a computing system independent manner (Fig. 45 user (110), authentication server (120), and apparatus server (130)).

26. As per claim 19, French teaches the method wherein the reception software module is implemented in Java (Page 3 par. 0062, page 4 par. 0071).

27. As per claim 20, French teaches the method wherein one of the at least one processing software modules is a sink bean (Page 11 par. 0180).

28. As per claim 21, French teaches the method of claim further comprising generating a certificate in the bean (Page 11 par. 0173).

29. As per claims 22, and 54 French teaches the method of claim 19 further comprising publishing information regarding the management of the certificate in one of the at least one processing software modules (Page 4 par. 0156).

30. As per claim 24, French teaches the method wherein two of the software modules operate on different computing devices (Page 1 par. 0019, Fig. 45 authentication server (120) and application server (130), and user (110)).

31. As per claim 28, French teaches the apparatus wherein one of the at least one processing software modules generates a digital certificate (Page 9 par. 0156).

32. As per claims 33 and 48, French teaches the computer program product wherein the one or more instructions for performing generates a digital certificate (Page 11 par. 0180).

33. As per claims 34, and 49, French teaches the computer program product of claim 30 wherein the one or more instructions for performing publishes information regarding a digital certificate (Fig. 45 No. 130, Page 4 par. 0066).

34. As per claim 37, French teaches the method wherein the plurality reception software modules are implemented in Java (Page 3 par. 0062, page 4 par. 0071).

35. As per claim 38, French teaches the method of further comprising generating a certificate in one of the at least one processing software module (Page 9 par. 0156).

36. As per claim 39, French teaches the method of claim 35 further comprising publishing information regarding the management of the certificate in one of the at least one processing software modules (Page 11 par. 0173).

37. As per claim 41, French teaches the apparatus, wherein the at least one reception software module and the at least one transmission software module are implemented in a computing

system independent manner (Fig. 45 user (110), authentication server (120), and apparatus server (130)).

38. As per claim 42, French teaches the apparatus of claim 41 wherein the at least one reception software module and the at least one transmission software module are implemented are implemented in Java (Page 3 par. 0062, page 4 par. 0071).

39. As per claim 43, French teaches the apparatus of claim 40 wherein one of the at least one processing software modules generates a digital certificate (Page 11 par. 0180).

40. As per claim 44, French teaches the apparatus of claim 40 wherein one of the at least one processing software modules publishes information regarding the management of the certificate (Page 9 par. 0155).

41. As per claim 46, French teaches the computer program product, wherein the first instructions for transmitting and the second instructions for transmitting are implemented in a computing system independent manner (Fig. 45 application server (130) and authentication server (120) both receive information (Page 4 par. 0066) and compute independently).

42. As per claim 47, French teaches the computer program product of claim 46 wherein the first instructions for transmitting and the second instructions for transmitting are implemented in Java (Page 3 par. 0062, page 4 par. 0071).

43. As per claim 51, French teaches the method, wherein the first transmission software module and the second transmission software module are implemented a computing system independent manner (Fig. 45 user (110), authentication server (120), and apparatus server (130)).

44. As per claim 52, French teaches the method wherein the first transmission software module and the second transmission software module are implemented in Java. (Page 3 par. 0062, page 4 par. 0071)

45. 53. As per claim 53, French teaches the method further comprising generating a certificate in one of the at least one processing software module (Page 11 par. 0173).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

46. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

47. Claims 7, 15, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over French et al. (French, Pub. No: US 2001/0001877 A1) in view of Carter (US Patent No.: 6,738,907 B1)

48. As per claim 7, French teaches all the subject matter described above.

French does not explicitly teach software a module publishes information in LDAP directory.

However, Carter teaches the apparatus wherein the one of the at least one software modules publishes information in directory service protocol such as the Lightweight Directory Access Protocol. (Col. 4 lines 11–33, col. 5 lines 22-34)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to employ the teachings of Carter with in the system of French because it would implement the database according to LDAP directory service protocol and allow access to directory server (Col. 4 lines 11–33, col. 5 lines 22-34).

49. As per claim 15, French teaches all the subject matter described above.

French does not explicitly teach software a module publishes information in LDAP directory.

However, Carter teaches the computer program product wherein the one of the at least one software modules publishes information in directory service protocol such as the Lightweight Directory Access Protocol. (Col. 4 lines 11–33, col. 5 lines 22-34)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to employ the teachings of Carter with in the system of French because it would implement the database according to LDAP directory service protocol and allow access to directory server (Col. 4 lines 11–33, col. 5 lines 22-34).

50. As per claim 23, French teaches all the subject matter described above.

French does not explicitly teach software a module publishes information in LDAP directory.

However, Carter teaches the method wherein the one of the at least one software modules publishes information in directory service protocol such as the Lightweight Directory Access Protocol. (Col. 4 lines 11–33, col. 5 lines 22-34)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to employ the teachings of Carter with in the system of French because it would implement the database according to LDAP directory service protocol and allow access to directory server (Col. 4 lines 11–33, col. 5 lines 22-34).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Eleni A Shiferaw whose telephone number is 703-305-0326. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8:00am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz R Sheikh can be reached on 703-305-9648. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Eleni Shiferaw

Art Unit 2136

AYAZ SHEIKH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100